

Appl. No. 10/804,918
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No. CE10557W
Customer No. 23330

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 remain pending in the application. The actions taken are in the interest of expediting prosecution and with no intention of surrendering any range of equivalents to which Applicants would otherwise be entitled in view of the prior art. Moreover, the amendment or cancellation of claims herein is without prejudice to pursuing claims of different scope by way of continuing Application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

U.S.C. 102(e)

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application (2004/0053573 (Karusawa). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicant's independent claim 1 calls for, among other things, a method for registering multiple communication devices in a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) based communication system comprising setting a priority for the identified communication device in the SIP based communication system.

Karusawa teaches a single mobile phone, which upon detection of an incoming call, selects one of a plurality of local wireless communication devices to route the call to based on a priority of the local wireless communication devices (Abstract). Local communication devices in Karusawa refer to devices that communicate solely using short-range Local Area Network (LAN) technologies such as IEEE 802.11, Bluetooth, and the like (paragraph 0001 and 0035).

On the other hand, Applicant's recited limitations include registering multiple communication devices in an SIP based communication system. Karusawa does not teach or suggest the use of an SIP based communication to register multiple communication devices. As is known in the art (see reference included with this Response), SIP is designed to address the functions of signaling and session management within a packet telephony network. "Signaling" allows call information to be carried across network boundaries. "Session management" provides the ability to control the attributes of an end-to-end call. SIP is also a peer-to-peer protocol. The teachings of Karusawa are limited to a single mobile device (cell phone) communicating with a plurality of strictly short-range communication devices (such as Bluetooth

Appl. No. 10/804,918
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No. CE10557W
Customer No. 23330

headsets, 802.11 routers, etc.). SIP is not applicable to the method taught by Karusawa and cannot be used in such a method. Further, the single mobile phone and short-range devices in Karusawa are not operating in a peer-to-peer environment as required under SIP, but instead operate in a master-slave environment where the mobile phone is the master, and the short-range devices are slaves (the short-range devices are not "peers" to the mobile phone, but merely slaves).

Since Karusawa does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of Applicant's claim 1, it cannot anticipate claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and claim 1 proceed to allowance.

U.S.C. 103

Claim 2 is rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Karusawa in view of Thubert (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0098507, hereinafter Tubert). Claims 3-16 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Karusawa and Thubert in further view of Matsuzaki et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0162870, hereinafter Matsuzaki). Claims 17-25 are rejected under U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pepper et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,700, hereinafter Pepper) in view of Karusawa.

It is incumbent upon the Examiner to prove a *prima facie* case of obviousness (MPEP 2142). To establish a *prima facie* case three basic criteria must be met. First, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference.

Applicant respectfully traverse this rejection as all of the claimed elements are not found in the cited references. Applicant's independent claim 1 calls for, among other things, a method for registering multiple communication devices in a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) based communication system comprising setting a priority for the identified communication device in the SIP based communication system. Independent claim 17 calls for, among other things, a method for expediting a call to a registered user of multiple communication devices in a Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) based communication system, comprising receiving by a

Appl. No. 10/804,918
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No. CE10557W
Customer No. 23330

network a call to the registered user in the SIP based communication system. Independent claim 21 calls for, among other things, a database entry for a session initiation protocol (SIP) based communication system, comprising an entry in a database for a type of communication device corresponding to the user including: a first field for indicating an identification corresponding to the type of communication device in the SIP based communication system.

Karusawa teaches a mobile phone, which upon detection of an incoming call, selects one of a plurality of local wireless communication devices to route the call to based on a priority of the local wireless communication devices (Abstract). Local communication devices in Karusawa refer to devices that communicate solely using short-range Local Area Network (LAN) technologies such as IEEE 802.11, Bluetooth, and the like (paragraph 0001 and 0035).

On the other hand, Applicant's recited limitations include an SIP based communication system. Karusawa does not teach or suggest the use of an SIP based communication to register multiple communication devices. As is known in the art (see reference included with this Response), SIP is designed to address the functions of signaling and session management within a packet telephony network. "Signaling" allows call information to be carried across network boundaries. "Session management" provides the ability to control the attributes of an end-to-end call. SIP is also a peer-to-peer protocol. The teachings of Karusawa are limited to a single mobile device (cell phone) communicating with a plurality of strictly short-range communication devices (such as Bluetooth headsets, 802.11 routers, etc.). SIP is not applicable to the method taught by Karusawa and cannot be used in such a method. Further, the single mobile phone and short-range devices in Karusawa are not operating in a peer-to-peer environment as required under SIP, but instead operate in a master-slave environment where the mobile phone is the master, and the short-range devices are slaves (the short-range devices are not "peers" to the mobile phone, but merely slaves). The teachings of Thubert, Matsuzaki and Pepper do not make up for the deficiency of Karusawa as they do not teach the use of SIP as claimed by Applicant's independent claims.

Since cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed limitations of Applicant's independent claims 1, 17 and 21, they cannot make obvious Applicant's independent claims 1, 17 and 21. 1. The remaining claims depend from the independent claims, either directly or indirectly, and are therefore allowable for the same reasons. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and that the claims proceed to allowance.

Appl. No. 10/804,918
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No. CE10557W
Customer No. 23330

Prior Art

The references cited but not relied upon are believed not to anticipate or make obvious Applicants' invention.

Summary

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Applicants believe that the subject application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicants.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicant's attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/804,918
Amdt. Dated January 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

Docket No. CE10557W
Customer No. 23330


Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to 502117,
Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
1303 East Algonquin Road
IL01/3rd Floor
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 23330

By: _____


Kevin D. Willis
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 43,993
Telephone: 480-732-5364
Fax No.: 480-732-2402